

Appl. No. 10/672,955

Amdt. dated September 27, 2007

Reply to Office Communication of September 12, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has received the Office Communication dated September 12, 2007, in which the Examiner asserted that newly added claims 19 and 20 were not addressed in the Response filed June 29, 2007 as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(b). Applicant previously explained that newly added claims 19 and 20 were patentable for much the same reason as their independent base claims. However, to clarify this point Applicant hereby re-submits the Response, now amended to include arguments pointing out the specific distinctions that render newly presented claims 19 and 20 patentable over the prior art.

In the Office Action dated April 5, 2007, the Examiner: 1) rejected claims 1-11 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as allegedly indefinite; and 2) rejected claims 1-11 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Wallach et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,292,905, hereinafter “Wallach”). With this Response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7 and 15-18 and added new claims 19-20. Based on the amendments and arguments herein, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2ND PARAGRAPH

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as allegedly indefinite for containing the terms “minimally configured” and “temporarily.” In the interest of compact prosecution, Applicant complies with the Examiner’s request that these claims be amended to remove all instances of “minimally configured” and “temporarily.” Because Applicant has complied with the Examiner’s request, Applicant kindly requests that the Examiner remove this rejection.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

During a telephone interview on June 26, 2007, the undersigned and the Primary Examiner together agreed that amending the independent claims to recite that “a workstation is re-configured as a server upon transfer of software to the workstation” (or a similar limitation) would make all pending claims patentable over Wallach, since Wallach fails to teach or suggest such a limitation. In accordance with that agreement, Applicant amends each of the independent

claims 1, 7, 15 and 17 to include such a limitation. Because the amended independent claims (and, therefore, the dependent claims) contain subject matter that is patentable over Wallach, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove this rejection.

III. NEWLY PRESENTED CLAIMS 19 AND 20

Newly presented claim 19 depends on independent claim 1. A dependent claim inherently includes the limitations of the claim(s) on which it depends. Therefore, because claim 19 depends on claim 1, claim 19 also requires "a workstation is re-configured as a server upon transfer of software to the workstation," as does claim 1. As explained above, and as agreed to by the Examiner, Wallach fails to teach or suggest such a limitation. Therefore, dependent claim 19 is patentable over Wallach.

Newly presented claim 20 depends on independent claim 7. A dependent claim inherently includes the limitations of the claim(s) on which it depends. Therefore, because claim 20 depends on claim 7, claim 20 also requires "wherein the workstation is adapted to cause client applications to be transferred to the workstation from the file system via at least one of the file servers when requested by the client computer so that the workstation is re-configured as a server," as does claim 7. As explained above, and as agreed to by the Examiner, Wallach fails to teach or suggest such a limitation. Therefore, dependent claim 20 is patentable over Wallach.

IV. CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicant may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Appl. No. 10/672,955

Amdt. dated September 27, 2007

Reply to Office Communication of September 12, 2007

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nick P. Patel/

Nick P. Patel
PTO Reg. No. 57,365
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPLICANT

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400